

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 889

TE 001 445

By-Crisp, Raymond D.

The Professional Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers: A Report of the Self-Evaluations of Experienced Illinois Secondary School English Teachers. Interim Report.

Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-5-0789

Pub Date Dec 68

Contract-OEC-5-10-029

Note-61p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$3.15

Descriptors-Bachelors Degrees, *English Instruction, Inservice Teacher Education, Masters Degrees, Oral Communication, Reading Instruction, *Secondary School Teachers, *Self Evaluation, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Education, Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Evaluation, *Teacher Experience, Teacher Qualifications, *Teaching Skills

Identifiers-Project English

This study was designed to determine (1) how experienced secondary school English teachers evaluate themselves in knowledge of English and in English teaching abilities, and (2) the relationships among this self-evaluation, number of years of teaching experience, and college degrees. In mid-November, 1967, the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers sent their "Self-Rating Scale for Experienced English Teachers" (Form G) to 600 randomly selected Illinois teachers. On the basis of the forms returned (577), the conclusions were that (1) teachers with more teaching experience tended to rate themselves higher than those with less experience, (2) teachers with master's degrees rated themselves higher than those with bachelor's degrees, (3) secondary teachers generally considered themselves "good" in professional competency, with their strongest category being "Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication" and their weakest, "Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English," especially reading. An examination of these self-evaluations indicates a need for adding courses to the teacher preparation curriculums and for making available more inservice education programs. (LH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-19-23-68

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

THE PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY OF ILLINOIS
SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS:
A Report of the Self-Evaluations of Experienced
Illinois Secondary School English Teachers

Raymond D. Crisp
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

December, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION
OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Director: J. N. Hook
Assoc. Director: Paul H. Jacobs
Research Assoc.: Raymond D. Crisp

Project Headquarters:
1210 W. California
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
Robert Bush, Stanford University
Nelson W. Francis, Brown University
Nathaniel Gage, Stanford University
Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University
William Riley Parker, Indiana University (Deceased)
Robert C. Pooley, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Loren Reid, University of Missouri
William Sheldon, Syracuse University
James R. Squire, formerly of the University of Illinois; past Executive
Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

John S. Gerrietts, Loyola University, past member and Chairman
John M. Heissler, Illinois State University, past Chairman
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois
Paul H. Jacobs, University of Illinois
Alfred L. Papillon, DePaul University, Chairman
Justus R. Pearson, Illinois Wesleyan University, past member and Chairman
Roy K. Weshinskey, Southern Illinois University, past Chairman

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Aurora College - Roy L. Crews and Ethel W. Tapper
Bradley University - W. F. Elwood and Paul Sawyer
DePaul University - Margaret Neville and Alfred L. Papillon
Greenville College - I. D. Baker and Donald Pennington
Illinois Institute of Technology - A. L. Davis and Henry C. Knepler
Illinois State University - Victor E. Gimmetstad and John M. Heissler
Illinois Wesleyan University - Justus R. Pearson and Clifford Pfeltz
Knox College - Michael G. Crowell and Carl Eisemann
Loyola University - Sister Mary Constantine and James Barry
Monmouth College - Grace Boswell and Ben T. Shawver
North Central College - Richard M. Eastman and Erling Peterson
Northwestern University - Sidney Bergquist and Wallace Douglas
Olivet Nazarene College - Fordyce Bennett and Vernon T. Groves
Rockford College - William D. Baker and Ronald Podeschi
Roosevelt University - William Leppert and William Makely
Saint Xavier College - Thomas Deegan and George McGuire
Southern Illinois University - Ellen A. Frogner and Roy Weshinskey
University of Chicago - Janet A. Emig and Robert Parker
University of Illinois - J. N. Hook and Paul H. Jacobs
Western Illinois University - Alfred Lindsey, Jr. and Sherman Rush

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	3
METHOD	4
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	5
RESULTS	5
DISCUSSION	29
CONCLUSIONS	43
RECOMMENDATIONS	45
SUMMARY	47
REFERENCES	50

APPENDIX I

Illinois Self-Rating Scale for Experienced English Teachers (Form G)	52
---	----

LIST OF TABLES

1. Enrollments of Schools Represented by Illinois Secondary School English Teachers	6
2. College Major and Minor of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers	6
3. College Degrees Held by Illinois Secondary School English Teachers	7
4. College Credit Hours Beyond the Highest Degree Held by Illinois Secondary School English Teachers	7
4-A: College Credit Hours Beyond the Bachelor's Degree . . .	8
4-B: College Credit Hours Beyond the Master's Degree . . .	8
5. Years of Teaching Experience of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers:	
5-A: Four-Year Intervals	9
5-B: Ten-Year Intervals	9
5-C: Twenty-Year Intervals	9
6. Correlation Matrix of Years of Teaching Experience with Averages of Self-Ratings of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers and Intercorrelation Matrix of Averages of Self-Ratings . . .	11
7. Percentages of Averages of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers for the Major Categories on the Self-Rating Scale .	12
7-A: Combined Percentages of Averages of Ratings of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers for the Major Categories on the Self-Rating Scale	15
8. Percentages of Ratings of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers for Each Criterion on the Self-Rating Scale	16
8-A: Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge of Language	17
8-B: Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition. .	18
8-C: Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge and Skill in Literature	19
8-D: Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication .	20
8-E: Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English . .	21
9. Percentages of Averages of Ratings of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers with Bachelor's and Master's Degrees for the Major Categories on the Self-Rating Scale	22
9-A: Combined Percentages of Averages for Teachers with Bachelor's and Master's Degrees for the Major Categories on the Self-Rating Scale	23

10.	Percentages of Ratings of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers with Bachelor's and Master's Degrees for Each Criterion on the Self-Rating Scale	25
10-A:	Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge of Language	26
10-B:	Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition	26
10-C:	Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge and Skill in Literature	27
10-D:	Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication	27
10-E:	Combined Percentages of Ratings for Category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English	28

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I should like to express my personal gratitude to the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Teachers of English for supplying funds which made this study possible and to each Illinois English teacher who took the time and care to complete and return the self-evaluation scale used in the survey.

Appreciated assistance in completing this study came from several sources. However, I want to extend a special thank you to the Office Staff of ISCPET for its very capable clerical assistance. Also, I want especially to thank Professor J. N. Hook for his encouragement, guidance, and assistance, and the members of the Executive Committee of ISCPET for their individual comments and criticisms and their collective vote of confidence.

R.D.C.

INTRODUCTION

How do experienced secondary school English teachers evaluate themselves on given areas of knowledge in English and knowledge and skill in the teaching of English? Do experienced secondary school English teachers consider, for the most part, that they are "superior" in their knowledge of language, literature, composition, and in their ability to teach these same subjects? Or, do they feel that they are woefully lacking in knowledge in these areas because of poor preparation for teaching or inadequate in-service preparation programs?

What does actual teaching experience do to the self-evaluations of experienced English teachers? Do teachers with more years of teaching experience tend to rate themselves higher in given areas of knowledge in English and knowledge and skill in the teaching of English than those teachers who have less experience? And, similarly, what does the level of college preparation do to these self-evaluations? That is, do teachers who have a bachelor's degree tend to rate themselves lower than those teachers who have a master's degree?

The Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET) has sought answers to these questions, as well as many other questions pertinent to the preparation of secondary school English teachers. ISCPET, under the direction of Professor J. N. Hook of the University of Illinois, is supported by funds supplied in accordance with a contract with the U. S. Office of Education. Representatives of the twenty institutions involved in ISCPET (Aurora College, Bradley University, DePaul University, Greenville College, Illinois Institute of Technology, Illinois State University, Illinois Wesleyan University, Knox College, Loyola University, Monmouth College, North Central College, Northwestern University, Olivet Nazarene College, Rockford College, Roosevelt University, Saint Xavier College, Southern Illinois University, University of Chicago, University of Illinois, and Western Illinois University) are conducting a five-year study of ways of improving teacher preparation. Each of the cooperating institutions is conducting at least one Special Research Study¹ which is responsible for treating in depth a particular facet or problem area of the many concerns of the preparation of secondary school English teachers. One project, though, which is conducted in common is an extended five-year evaluation program of the ISCPET English teacher preparation curriculums of the ISCPET institutions. For this curriculum evaluation program, evaluations of the levels of proficiency in knowledge of English and knowledge and skill in the teaching of English of the ISCPET English teacher preparatory curriculum are sought. The Project Staff of ISCPET developed the

Illinois Teacher Rating Scales (Forms A-F) in order to obtain this evaluative data. The data have been obtained by these Forms over a period of from two to four years and have been supplied by the graduates themselves after student teaching and after the first year of teaching experience (Forms A and D, respectively); by their critic and cooperating teachers at the end of student teaching (Forms B and C, respectively); and by their departmental chairmen and their employers at the end of the first year of English teaching (Forms E and F, respectively).

A seventh Form, Form G: For Experienced English Teachers, was developed in order to answer the opening questions of this report. Also, Form G is expected to supply a comparison with the data that are being obtained by Forms A through F.

ISCPET's Illinois Teacher Rating Scales are based upon, and reflect almost entirely, an earlier accomplishment of the Institutional Representatives of ISCPET. The representatives, drawn from the departments of English and Education of the cooperating institutions, prepared a preliminary statement on the "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English."² The Institutional Representatives based these qualifications of secondary school English teachers upon their own experience and observations; upon the recommendations of an advisory committee composed of twelve nationally known persons in English, Speech, and Education; and upon additional recommendations from Illinois authorities on certification, school administrators, secondary school English consultants, English department heads, and English teachers. The "Qualifications Statement," as it has come to be known, has three major categories: Personal Qualifications, Knowledge in English, and Knowledge and Skill in the Teaching of English. The category of Knowledge of English is subsequently broken down into four sub-categories: Knowledge of Language; Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition; Knowledge and Skill in Literature; Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication. That categorical division is admittedly artificial and is made only for the sake of coherence in presentation. Competencies in language, literature and composition are in truth inseparable; professional and academic qualifications necessarily interact.³

The "Qualifications Statement" treats three levels of proficiency: "Minimal," "Good," and "Superior."

The "Minimal" level of qualification describes the competence to be expected of a secondary school English teacher who has no more than a teaching minor in English. It may, however, also describe the competencies of an English major whose ability is only mediocre or whose college preparation has been of less than average quality.

The "Good" level of qualification describes competencies reasonable to expect in able or fairly able English majors whose ability and college preparation have been average or better in quality.

The "Superior" level of qualification describes competencies to be expected in highly able persons whose college preparation has been of very good or excellent quality; it is likely to include graduate work and may require some years of teaching experience.

As stated above, ISCPET's Illinois Teacher Rating Scales (Forms A-F)

are based upon the "Qualifications Statement." The Rating Scales reflect the areas of competencies or qualifications with only a few minor changes or additions. Two categories are added to the Rating Scales which are not among the five categories on the "Qualifications Statement": Personal Qualifications (Forms A-G) and Professional Qualifications (Form E only). Also, the levels of competency of "Superior," "Good," and "Minimal" have been extended to include "Average" and "Subminimal." Further, these levels of competency have been equated to an ordinal scale of from 1 through 5: "Superior"--1; "Good"--2; "Average"--3; "Minimal"--4; and "Subminimal"--5. Thus, the Illinois Teacher Rating Scales (Forms A-F) seek an evaluation of a teacher (self-evaluation in three instances) on thirty-five criteria (twenty-five on Form E), each criterion being rated on a level of competence of from 1 through 5, or from "Superior" to "Subminimal."

PURPOSE

As stated above, the Illinois Teacher Rating Scale for Experienced English Teachers (Form G) was a recent addition to the ISCPET Illinois Teacher Rating Scales (Forms A-F). Basically, Form G is the same rating instrument as Forms A through F, but its use is unique. Form G was designed primarily to obtain the self-evaluations of experienced English teachers. Also, it was established in an effort to determine reliability and validity of ISCPET's basic series of Rating Scales (Forms A-F), to supply comparative data for the data being obtained by Forms A through F, and to aid in the attempt to establish a norm or base line for further use of the Illinois Teacher Rating Scales. This report, however, will concern itself only with the data obtained by Form G in discussing the questions of:

- 1) How do experienced secondary school English teachers rate themselves in areas of Knowledge of English and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English?
- 2) Is there a significant relationship or correlation between the self-evaluations of experienced secondary school English teachers and the number of years of experience?
- 3) Is there a significant relationship between those self-evaluations and the college degree held by the secondary school English teacher; that is, do teachers who hold a master's degree consistently rate themselves higher than do teachers who hold the bachelor's degree?

METHOD

ISCPET's Illinois Teacher Rating Scale for Experienced English Teachers (Form G) was distributed to 600 secondary school English teachers who were teaching in the state of Illinois during the academic year 1967-68. Most likely the majority of these teachers are "career" teachers in Illinois, but the only safe assumption about stability is the one just stated: namely, that the teachers were teaching secondary school English in Illinois during the academic year 1967-68. No attempt was made to select English teachers on the basis of having graduated from an Illinois college or university. Again, perhaps the majority of the teachers did in fact graduate from an Illinois institution, but this would be a needless fact to establish.

The population for this study had been defined as experienced secondary school teachers of English who were teaching in Illinois. Thus a random sample was taken from this population, or at least from what could be considered the most complete definition (or listing) of that population: the membership of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English and the Illinois membership of the Secondary Section of the National Council of Teachers of English.

Thus, in mid-November, 1967, 300 teachers were randomly selected from each of the above organizations. Careful records were maintained of the distribution lists, and duplications were avoided. The random sample of 600 was in fact 600 different individuals. Those who were members of both the IATE and the NCTE received only one rating scale if their names appeared in both random samples.

By late December, 1967, 341 completed Rating Scales had been received. Although the ideal would have been achieved had there been a 100% return, nevertheless, the 57% return is a statistically respectable percentage and does furnish a respectable amount of data on which to base observations and conclusions for the sample population.

The criticism might be raised here that the sample is somewhat biased in that it is of the more professional English teachers since selection was made from membership listings of the IATE and the NCTE. Purposive sampling is always a possibility in any kind of survey, and, of course, should be avoided if possible. But too often the costs of original mailings, follow-ups, and continued follow-ups prohibit using a mailing list of schools rather than a specific mailing list of names of teachers. Also, the membership listings of the IATE and the NCTE are the most nearly complete of the available directories of the defined population for this survey. Thus, the amount of purposive sampling that has occurred in this study was unavoidable. Further, results of this purposive sampling are not detrimental to this study as long as one bears in mind that the population is experienced English teachers in the state of Illinois, as represented by the membership of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English and the Illinois membership of the National Council of Teachers of English.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

A 1620 Solid State Electronic Computer was used to obtain means for the entire rating scale and the six major categories of the self-evaluations of each of the respondents in the survey. Means were obtained by using the numerical value of the ordinal scale of 1="Superior"; 2="Good"; 3="Average"; 4="Minimal"; and 5="Subminimal." The six major categories are those of Personal Qualifications, Knowledge of Language, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition, Knowledge and Skill in Literature, Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication, and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English. The percentages of the ratings (1 through 5) for the thirty-five criteria were obtained for all the data. Also, the percentages of the means for the major categories falling in interval ranges of from 1.0 to 5.0 were obtained for each of the six categories on the Rating Scale as well as the entire rating scale. The 1620 Electronic Computer's regression correlation program was used to obtain a Pearson-Product Moment Correlation on ranks of the over-all means, the six sub-means of the self-evaluations, and the number of years of English teaching experience. The .01 level of significance, for a two-tailed test, was selected as the level of confidence for the correlation coefficients.

RESULTS

Results of this survey are based on 341 completed Illinois Teacher Rating Scales for Experienced English Teachers--a return of 57% from experienced Illinois secondary school English teachers.

Tabulated summaries of some of the biographical data sought by the Rating Scale are presented in this report only as background information to the self-evaluations of the experienced English teachers. No statistical analyses of these data in relation to the self-evaluations were attempted. For the most part, the results of this biographical section of this survey concur with the results of two ISCPET Special Research Studies.⁴

Although the process of randomly selecting the participants in this survey did not include a stratified sampling technique to insure that all areas of the state were represented, most of the geographical areas of the state were represented. For purposes of summary, though, the state has been divided into only three sections: north, central, and south. The northern area of the state is represented with a 65% return, the central section with a 19% return, and the southern area with a 14% return. Two percent of the respondents did not indicate the location of their schools. It is no surprise that the largest representation should be from the northern area of the state: it is the most populous area.

Just as the sample is representative of most areas of the state, the random sample of secondary school English teachers is also representative of various sizes of schools. Table 1 below shows that teachers in schools of enrollments ranging from one hundred or so to 6,000 are represented.

TABLE 1: ENROLLMENTS OF SCHOOLS REPRESENTED BY
ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Enrollment	N	Percent	Enrollment	N	Percent
0---500	69	20.23	3,001-4,000	20	5.86
501-1,000	64	18.76	4,001-5,000	18	5.27
1,001-2,000	90	26.39	5,001-6,000	5	1.46
2,001-3,000	53	15.54	Not indicated	22	6.45
TOTAL				341	99.96

As can be noted, school enrollment most represented is from 1,001 to 2,000. Also obvious is the inverse relationship between enrollment and representation in the sample: the larger the school, the fewer representatives of those schools in this sample. Most likely this is caused by the existence of few very large schools in Illinois, but this relationship could have been caused by sampling error.

Four other items of interest remain before we look at the data which summarize the self-evaluations. Those are: the college major, the degree held, the number of hours beyond the degree held, and the number of years of teaching experience. Table 2 gives figures on the college major and minor.

TABLE 2: COLLEGE MAJOR AND MINOR OF
ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

	N	Percent
English Major	262	76.83
English Minor (only)	60	17.59
No English Major or Minor	19	5.57
TOTAL	341	99.99

Those who reported no English major or minor reported majors in just about all the other subject areas or college major areas such as physical education, home economics, foreign languages, physics, chemistry, history, speech, Latin, biology, and botany. It is interesting to note that despite the fact that these teachers are not English majors, they are nevertheless members of at least one professional organization for English teachers.

Table 3 gives data on the college degree held by these teachers in the sample.

TABLE 3: COLLEGE DEGREES HELD BY
ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Degree	N	Percent
Bachelor's Degree	159	46.63
Master's Degree	179	52.49
Advanced Certificate	1	.30
Doctorate	2	.58
TOTAL	341	100.00

Table 4 presents information on the number of college credit hours obtained by teachers in the sample beyond the highest degree held. The number of teachers involved here is 338 rather than the total 341 respondents in the sample because two teachers in the sample, as reported on Table 2, hold the doctorate degree and one teacher holds an advanced certificate. These teachers reported having no college credit hours beyond their degrees. "College credit hours" in this frequency count include both English and non-English graduate college courses.

TABLE 4: COLLEGE CREDIT HOURS BEYOND THE HIGHEST
DEGREE HELD BY ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Credit Hours	N	Percent
0	65	19.23
1-10	68	20.11
11-20	83	24.55
21-30	58	17.16
31-40	39	11.53
41 or over	25	7.39
TOTAL	338	99.97

Tables 4-A and 4-B present information on the number of college credit hours obtained beyond the highest degree by grouping the teachers by the bachelor's degree and the master's degree.

TABLE 4-A: COLLEGE CREDIT HOURS
BEYOND THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

Credit Hours	N	Percent
0	31	19.50
1-10	35	22.01
11-20	38	23.90
21-30	32	20.13
31-40	18	11.32
41 or over	5	3.14
TOTAL	159	100.00

TABLE 4-B: COLLEGE CREDIT HOURS
BEYOND THE MASTER'S DEGREE

Credit Hours	N	Percent
0	34	19.00
1-10	33	18.44
11-20	45	25.14
21-30	26	14.53
31-40	21	11.73
41 or over	20	11.16
TOTAL	179	100.00

Tables 5-A, 5-B, and 5-C give the number of years of English teaching experience represented by the sample. Essentially, these tables contain the same information. The three tables using different intervals for the years of teaching experience are given to facilitate quick comparisons.

TABLE 5: YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF
ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

TABLE 5-A: FOUR-YEAR INTERVALS

Number of Years	N	Percent
0- 3	83	24.34
4- 7	78	22.87
8-11	74	21.70
12-15	30	8.80
16-19	21	6.16
20-23	18	5.28
24-27	6	1.76
28-31	12	3.52
32-35	8	2.35
36-39	8	2.35
40-43	2	.57
44-45	1	.30
TOTAL	341	100.00

TABLE 5-B: TEN-YEAR INTERVALS

Number of Years	N	Percent
0-10	218	63.93
11-20	74	21.70
21-30	29	8.50
31-40	18	5.28
41-45	2	.57
TOTAL	341	99.98

TABLE 5-C: TWENTY-YEAR INTERVALS

Number of Years	N	Percent
0-20	286	83.87
21-45	55	16.13
TOTAL	341	100.00

It can be noted in the above tables that by far the majority of the teachers in the sample have taught ten years or less (Table 5-C). Further, it is interesting to note the sharp drop in representation of years of teaching experience between the eleven- and twelve-year intervals.

An examination of Table 5-A indicates that within the group of teachers who have taught ten years or less, the majority of the sample, 24.34 percent, have taught from between just a few months and three years. The greatest number of years of teaching experience reported in the survey was forty-five years; the least amount of secondary school English teaching was three months.

Table 6 reports the correlation matrix for the number of years of teaching experience with the averages of the self-ratings of the experienced English teachers and the intercorrelation matrix for the averages of the self-ratings. There are seven averages involved for each teacher and there are 341 teachers involved. The correlated means are those of the averages of the self-evaluations in each of the six major categories on the Rating Scale as well as the averages of the entire rating scale. A rank correlation was obtained, using a Pearson-Product Moment Correlation formula. The rank of 1 was assigned to the least number of years or months of experience and to the lowest (in numerical value, but highest in evaluation) rating, i.e., the rank of 1 was assigned to three months of teaching experience and to a rating of 1.00 (Superior). Ties were accommodated for. With 339 degrees of freedom at the 1% level of confidence, two-tailed test of significance, a correlation of .15 or larger is necessary.

The first row of negative correlations in Table 6 reports the correlations of teaching experience with the averages of the self-ratings, and the remaining rows and columns of the matrix report the intercorrelations of the averages of the self-evaluations. The negative correlations are caused by the inverse relationship of a self-evaluation average approaching 1.00, the highest rating of Superior on the Scale, tending to associate itself with a year of teaching experience approaching 45, the greatest number of years of teaching experience reported in the sample.

An examination of the correlation values obtained indicates that there is a trend toward a relationship between years of teaching experience and teachers' self-evaluations of their knowledge and skill in the given areas of English and the teaching of English. These correlations are significant at the 1% level of confidence. However, the seven correlational values are not sufficiently large enough to permit stating conclusively that there is a definite relationship between the teachers' self-ratings and years of teaching experience.

The highest correlation is that of the average of the entire rating scale with years of teaching experience. The lowest correlation with years of experience is the one reported for the average of the self-ratings on personal qualifications. The averages of the self-evaluations on the criteria under the major categories of language, literature, and composition also have low, but significant, correlations with years of experience. The averages of the self-ratings on knowledge and skill in teaching English, in comparison with the other correlations, obtained the second highest correlation.

TABLE 6: CORRELATION MATRIX OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
WITH AVERAGES OF SELF-RATINGS AND INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF
AVERAGES OF SELF-RATINGS OF ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

	Entire Rating Scale	Personal Qualifications	Knowledge of Language	Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition	Knowledge and Skill in Literature	Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication	Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English
Years of Experience	-.36	-.23	-.27	-.29	-.27	-.30	-.34
Entire Rating Scale		.74	.72	.79	.80	.75	.83
Personal Qualifications			.45	.56	.54	.55	.52
Knowledge of Language				.54	.53	.44	.52
Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition					.64	.53	.57
Knowledge and Skill in Literature						.47	.55
Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication							.66
Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English							

N=341; df=339; r=.15

Although a significant correlation does not indicate or assure a cause and effect relationship, common sense here would lead to the observation that knowledge and skill in teaching English would naturally improve as a teacher has more and more opportunity to see how various methods and approaches work for given material and students. Also, it is logical that as a teacher gains experience or spends more time in the field, he tends to be less familiar with current developments or to have less "college familiarity" with language, literature, and composition.

A summary of the self-evaluations of the 341 Illinois secondary school English teachers is presented in Table 7. This table indicates the percentage of the teachers in the sample whose mean self-evaluations fall within the rating categories ranging from Superior (1.0 to 1.5, inclusive) to Subminimal (4.6 to 5.0, inclusive) for the major categories of the Self-Rating Scale.

TABLE 7: PERCENTAGES OF AVERAGES OF ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS FOR THE MAJOR CATEGORIES ON THE SELF-RATING SCALE

	Superior 1.0-1.5	Good 1.6-2.5	Average 2.6-3.5	Minimal 3.6-4.5	Sub- Minimal 4.6-5.0	Not Observed	TOTAL
Entire Rating Scale	11.43	68.62	19.06	.87	.00	.00	99.98
Personal Qualifications	31.37	62.75	5.27	.58	.00	.00	99.97
Knowledge of Language	18.76	47.50	26.39	6.45	.87	.00	99.97
Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition	19.64	54.83	24.04	.87	.58	.00	99.96
Knowledge and Skill in Literature	16.12	58.94	22.58	2.05	.00	.29	99.98
Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication	30.49	49.56	18.47	1.46	.00	.00	99.98
Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English	13.48	53.37	30.20	2.63	.29	.00	99.97

N=341

A discussion of this table and of the following tables which present summarized data on the self-evaluations is going to seem to be pointing out the obvious. Essentially, the discussions will translate the data from summarized tabular form into prose. What might not be so obvious about the chart is just exactly what these data represent, why there are ranges, for example, of 1.0 to 1.5, and why there are seven major categories while there are thirty-five qualification criteria on the Self-Rating Scale.

These questions are better answered in terms of the Illinois Teacher Rating Scale for Experienced English Teachers. The Rating Scale is reproduced in Appendix I and has been described earlier in this report. No discussion is needed for the cover sheet which sought personal information concerning the teacher completing the Scale. However, attention should be brought to the instructions to the self-rater. The directions to the experienced English teacher asked him to rate himself on the criteria listed in the Rating Scale on a basis of Superior, Good, Average, Minimal, or Subminimal. These adjectives equated to a number, arbitrarily selected, ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 representing Superior, 5 representing Subminimal, and 2, 3, and 4 representing Good, Average, and Minimal, respectively. A zero represented "Not Observed." Also given in the directions to the self-rater was an evaluative key, i.e., a clarification as to how the terms Superior, Good, Average, Minimal, and Subminimal were being defined. (See Appendix I). Of course getting two people to agree on the definition of the word Superior, or any of the words in the evaluative key, is an almost impossible task. However, because of the statistically significant intercorrelations reported on page 11, it is apparent that a good deal of agreement on the definitions of the evaluative terms was obtained in the sample.

As previously explained, there are thirty-five qualifications criteria that make up the entire rating scale. These criteria are grouped under six major categories of Personal Qualifications, Knowledge of Language, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition, Knowledge and Skill in Literature, Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication, and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English. In Table 7, as with all tables reporting the self-evaluations, there are seven major categories reported because the "entire rating scale" is considered as a category. As the title of Table 7 explains, the percentages are those of the averages of the ratings for each of these major categories. In order to obtain these averages for each major category, the numeric value of the rating was used, all ratings for each category were summed, and the average of that sum was obtained. This was done for each respondent in the sample. A percentage was then obtained for the number of averages which fell within the given ranges.

It should be noted that all the major categories do not have the same number of criteria. For example, Personal Qualifications has seven, Knowledge of Language has four, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition has five, Knowledge and Skill in Literature has seven, and Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication has four criteria. The last category, Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, has eight criteria.

An examination of the data in Table 7 reveals that very few of the averages of the ratings for any of the major categories fall within the Subminimal range of 4.6 to 5.0. Less than one percent of the teachers rate themselves within this range on each of the major categories of Knowledge

of Language, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition, and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English. Also, very few teachers consider themselves Minimal. Although there are more, and larger, percentages in this range of 3.6 to 4.5 than is reported for the Subminimal range, the percentages are, for the most part, negligible. For example, almost one percent of the respondents rate themselves Minimal on each of the major categories of Entire Rating Scale, Personal Qualifications, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition, and Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication. Two percent of the teachers rate themselves within this range for both Knowledge and Skill in Literature and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English. A surprising 6.45 percent of the teachers fall within the Minimal range of 3.6 to 4.5 for the major category of Knowledge of Language.

Ignoring the Entire Rating Scale and Personal Qualifications categories for a moment, we can see that the category which has the largest percentage (30.49) for the Superior range is Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication. The smallest percentage (13.48) is for the category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English.

Again, without considering the Entire Rating Scale and Personal Qualifications averages, we can see that the largest percentage (58.94) for the range of Good, 1.6 to 2.5, is for Knowledge and Skill in Literature. And here, the smallest percentage (47.50) is reported for Knowledge of Language. Using the same system for the Average range of 2.6 to 3.5, we see that the largest percentage (30.20) is found for the category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, and the smallest percentage (18.47) is reported for Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication.

It is clearly indicated that the majority of the teachers in this sample rate themselves in the range of Good, 1.6 to 2.5. In all but two categories (Knowledge of Language and Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication) the percentages are over fifty percent. In the first of the two exceptions mentioned, there is a larger percentage for the Average range. For the second of the two mentioned exceptions, the trend is toward the Superior range.

In summary, then, the teachers in this sample consider their professional competency in the Knowledge of English and in the Skill of Teaching English to be "Good." This level of competency is defined in ISCPET's Preliminary Qualifications Statement as that level of qualification reasonable to expect in able or fairly able English majors whose ability and college preparation have been average or better in quality. The Illinois Teacher Rating Scale for Experienced English Teachers defines the "Good" level of competency to be "clearly above average." The teachers in the sample consider their strongest area to be Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication and their weakest areas to be Knowledge of Language and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English.

For the most part, the rating scale has turned out to be a three-point rating scale. Since so few teachers rated themselves Minimal or Subminimal, the ratings have become Superior, Good, and Average. There could be one of several factors or a combination of factors operating here to cause very few of the teachers to rate themselves minimal or subminimal. For example, the words "minimal" and "subminimal" have a certain connotation

that would require an almost insensitive, severe critic to rate even another person in these categories. Perhaps, too, the Self-Rating Scale is not discriminating sharply enough between the various degrees of competency as the scale attempts to define them. Then, again, perhaps we do not in fact have minimally or subminimally prepared teachers in Illinois. It should be remembered, too, that no scale can be devised that will absolutely determine, objectively, the degree of competency or the level of efficiency on any given attribute or quality.

Table 7-A reports the combined percentages of averages of ratings for Superior and Good, representing a range of 1.0 and 2.5, and for Average, Minimal, and Subminimal, representing a range of 2.6 to 5.0. As mentioned above, the ratings on the Scale seem to force a three-point scale. However, if a two-point scale is forced upon the data as Table 7-A does, strong and weak areas are quickly noted.

TABLE 7-A: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF AVERAGES OF
RATINGS OF ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH
TEACHERS FOR THE MAJOR CATEGORIES ON THE SELF-RATING SCALE

	Superior Good 1.0-2.5	Average Minimal Subminimal 2.6-5.0	Not Observed	TOTAL
Entire Rating Scale	80.05	19.93	.00	99.98
Personal Qualifications	94.12	5.85	.00	99.97
Knowledge of Language	66.26	33.71	.00	99.97
Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition	74.47	25.49	.00	99.96
Knowledge and Skill in Literature	75.06	24.63	.29	99.98
Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication	80.05	19.93	.00	99.98
Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English	66.85	33.12	.00	99.97

N=341

Table 7-A points out, a bit more sharply, what we noticed in Table 7. The weakest areas, by major categories, as determined by the experienced English teachers in this sample, are those categories of Knowledge of Language and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English.

The strongest area is Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication. Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition and Knowledge and Skill in Literature are also considered strong areas by the teachers in the sample.

Table 8 reports the percentages of ratings for each of the thirty-five criteria on the Rating Scale. Since these data are not summarized as much as those in Tables 7 and 7-A, particular strengths and weaknesses in the trends pointed out above can be noted. The numbers listed under "Criteria" on Table 8 refer to the individual criteria numerically identified on the Rating Scale. The Roman numerals refer to the major categories on the Rating Scale. Superior, Good, Average, Minimal, and Subminimal refer specifically to the numerical ratings of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. (See Appendix I.) These data in Table 8 are not summarized by percentages of averages of ratings. Rather, the percentages that are reported are the percentages of the number of 1's, 2's, 3's, and so on for any given criterion.

TABLE 8: PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS OF ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS FOR EACH CRITERION ON THE SELF-RATING SCALE

CRITERIA	SUPERIOR	GOOD	AVERAGE	MINIMAL	SUB-MINIMAL	NOT OBSERVED	TOTAL
I. 1	49.26	39.88	9.09	1.75	.00	.00	99.98
2	42.52	49.26	7.62	.58	.00	.00	99.98
3	25.80	56.01	17.30	.87	.00	.00	99.98
4	26.39	63.92	8.50	.87	.00	.29	99.97
5	41.64	44.86	11.73	.87	.29	.58	99.97
6	33.43	51.31	12.90	.87	.29	1.17	99.97
7	44.57	43.40	9.97	.29	.29	1.46	99.98
II.A. 8	21.40	47.21	24.63	5.57	.87	.29	99.97
9	16.71	35.48	30.20	13.78	2.34	1.46	99.97
10	23.16	41.93	23.16	8.50	2.34	.87	99.96
11	18.18	34.01	30.79	13.48	2.93	.58	99.97
II.B.12	44.28	46.62	7.62	.87	.29	.29	99.97
13	10.55	42.22	33.43	12.60	.87	.29	99.96
14	26.68	46.33	24.34	1.46	.58	.58	99.97
15	24.04	51.02	22.58	1.75	.58	.00	99.97
16	19.35	51.31	26.09	2.93	.29	.00	99.97
II.C.17	34.60	50.14	13.48	1.17	.29	.29	99.97
18	41.64	39.58	13.78	4.39	.29	.29	99.97
19	13.48	36.07	34.01	13.78	1.17	1.46	99.97
20	27.56	45.45	21.99	4.69	.00	.29	99.98
21	29.91	51.31	16.12	1.75	.00	.87	99.96
22	9.09	39.00	34.60	14.36	2.34	.58	99.97
23	28.44	41.93	25.21	2.63	.58	1.17	99.96
II.D.24	27.85	41.34	24.04	6.15	.58	.00	99.96
25	12.60	33.72	36.07	14.36	2.34	.87	99.96
26	41.34	43.40	14.36	.87	.00	.00	99.97
27	42.81	41.93	12.02	2.63	.29	.29	99.97
III. 28	24.92	51.02	21.99	1.75	.00	.29	99.97
29	14.66	36.65	35.77	11.14	1.46	.29	99.97
30	10.55	41.05	38.12	8.50	1.46	.29	99.97
31	30.20	46.62	20.52	2.05	.29	.29	99.97
32	19.94	42.22	30.79	5.57	.87	.58	99.97
33	29.03	49.26	17.59	2.93	.87	.29	99.97
34	12.60	27.85	31.67	21.70	6.15	.00	99.97
35	12.31	51.90	30.20	4.10	.58	.87	99.96

N=341

Table 3-A, 8-B, 8-C, 8-D, and 8-E report the combined percentages for the ratings of Superior and Good and for those of Average, Minimal, and Subminimal for each criterion and by major category. This combination of percentages is similar to the one used in Table 7-A for the percentages of averages of ratings. The percentages of ratings are combined so that trends in the self-evaluations for the individual criterion can be easily noted. The two-point, or two-scale, rating of Superior-Good and Average-Minimal-Subminimal is used since there is seldom more than two percent of the respondents falling under the Subminimal rating for any given criterion.

TABLE 8-A: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS
FOR CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE OF LANGUAGE

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5	Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0	Not Observed	TOTAL
II.A. 8	68.61	31.07	.29	99.97
9	52.19	46.32	1.46	99.97
10	65.09	34.00	.87	99.96
11	52.19	47.20	.58	99.97

N=341

Under the major category of Knowledge of Language, the majority of respondents consider themselves Superior-Good in preparation. In all four criteria that make up this category, over fifty percent of the respondents fall under the top rating. In comparison, though, these criteria can be divided into two groups: a relatively strong area and a relatively weak area. That is, 68.61 percent of the respondents consider themselves fairly strong in "knowledge of how language functions, including knowledge of the principles of semantics," and 65.09 percent consider themselves strong in "knowledge of levels of usage and dialectology, including a realization of the cultural implications of both." On the other hand, only 52.19 percent of the respondents consider themselves Superior-Good in "knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar" and in "knowledge of the history of the English language, with appropriate awareness of its phonological, morphological, and syntactic changes." In fact, almost fourteen percent of the respondents consider themselves minimally prepared in each of these two criteria. (See Table 8.)

TABLE 8-B: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS
FOR CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL
IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5	Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0	Not Observed	TOTAL
II.B.12	90.90	8.78	.29	99.97
13	52.77	46.90	.29	99.96
14	73.01	26.38	.58	99.97
15	75.06	24.91	.00	99.97
16	70.66	29.31	.00	99.97

N=341

Table 8-B presents the combined percentages for the category of Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition. Just as for the major category of Knowledge of Language, the majority of the respondents consider themselves prepared at the Superior-Good level for all criteria making up the category of Composition. In an inter-category comparison, the teachers consider themselves strongest in their "ability to recognize such characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage." In fact, 90.90 percent of the teachers in the sample consider their preparation in this criterion to be Superior-Good. It is interesting to note that Table 8 indicates that 44.28 percent of the teachers rate themselves Superior on this criterion. The teachers consider this their strongest area over all the criteria listed on the Rating Scale. In comparison, only a moderate percentage of the teachers consider themselves Superior-Good in their "ability to analyze in detail the strengths and weaknesses in the writing of students and to communicate the analysis effectively" (75.06), their "perception of the complexities in the processes of composing" (73.01), and their "proficiency in producing writing with considerable strength in the characteristics noted above" (70.66). The weakest area reported by the sampled teachers under the category of Composition is that criterion of "knowledge of theories and history of rhetoric and of the development of English prose." Only 52.77 percent of the teachers rate themselves Superior-Good on this criterion. Further, Table 8 indicates that 12.60 percent of the teachers rate themselves Minimal on this item.

TABLE 8-C: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS
FOR CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL
IN LITERATURE

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5	Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0	Not Observed	TOTAL
II.C.17	84.74	14.94	.29	99.97
18	81.22	18.46	.29	99.97
19	49.55	48.96	1.46	99.97
20	73.01	26.68	.29	99.98
21	81.22	17.87	.87	99.96
22	48.09	51.30	.58	99.97
23	70.37	28.42	1.17	99.96

N=341

The criteria under the category of Knowledge and Skill in Literature also fall into three groups. The rather strong area, determined by percentages in the low 80's, is made up of "knowledge of the important works of major English and American authors; knowledge of the characteristics of various genres and of major works in English and American literature in the genres," "knowledge of one or more major authors and of at least one genre, and one period," and "ability to read closely an unfamiliar literary text of above-average difficulty with good comprehension of its content and literary characteristics." The fairly strong area consists of two criteria. Seventy-three percent of the respondents rate themselves Superior-Good in "knowledge of such backgrounds of English and American literature as history, the Bible, mythology, and folklore," and 70.37 percent of the teachers consider themselves Superior-Good in "knowledge of a considerable body of literature suitable for adolescents." The weak area under this category of Literature consists of two criteria. Fifty-one and thirty-hundredths percent of the teachers rate themselves Average-Minimal-Subminimal in "knowledge of major critical theories and schools of criticism," and 48.96 percent of the respondents consider themselves average or below in "knowledge of major works of selected foreign writers, both ancient and modern, and of comparative literature." Table 8 indicates that for each of these two criteria, fourteen percent of the respondents consider themselves minimally prepared.

TABLE 8-D: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS
FOR CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL
IN ORAL COMMUNICATION

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5	Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0	Not Observed	TOTAL
II.D.24	69.19	30.77	.00	99.96
25	46.32	52.77	.87	99.96
26	84.74	15.23	.00	99.97
27	84.74	14.94	.29	99.97

N=341

The combined percentages for the category of Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication are presented in Table 8-D. The four criteria in this category also fall into a division of three groups. Two criteria are determined by percentages in the mid-eighties to be a rather strong area. The teachers in the survey consider themselves rather strong in their "ability to speak clearly and effectively, and in conformity with present standards of educated usage," and in their "ability to read aloud well enough to convey most aspects of the interpretive art: meaning, mood, dominant emotions, varying emotions, overtones, and variety." A second criterion is considered to be fairly strong by a 69.19 percentage of the teachers rating themselves Superior-Good in "knowledge of the principles of group discussion, group dynamics, oral reporting, panel discussions, classroom dramatizations, and choral reading; knowledge of the relationships between speaking and other facets of English." The rather weak area is determined by 52.77 percent of the respondents rating themselves Average-Minimal-Subminimal in "knowledge of current information relative to listening techniques." Here, Table 8 indicates that 14.36 percent of the respondents rate themselves minimally prepared in this criterion.

TABLE 8-E: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS
FOR CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL
IN TEACHING ENGLISH

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5	Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0	Not Observed	TOTAL
III. 28	75.94	23.74	.29	99.97
29	51.31	48.37	.29	99.97
30	51.60	48.08	.29	99.97
31	76.82	22.86	.29	99.97
32	62.16	37.23	.58	99.97
33	78.29	21.39	.29	99.97
34	40.45	59.52	.00	99.97
35	64.21	34.88	.87	99.96

N=341

The criteria which make up the category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English also fall into three groups: strong, average, and weak. The strong area is determined by percentages in the mid- and upper-seventies. Teachers in the survey consider themselves fairly strong in "knowledge of educational psychology, especially of the learning process and adolescent psychology," in "knowledge of the content, instructional materials, and organization of secondary English programs, and of the role of English in the total school program," and in "knowledge of effective ways to teach English, to select and adapt methods and materials for the varying interests and maturity levels of students, and to develop a sequence of assignments to guide and stimulate students in their study of language, written and oral communication, and literature." The average group is made up of four criteria. Fifty-one percent of the respondents consider themselves Superior-Good in "knowledge of the stages of language growth in children and youth" and in "knowledge of the philosophy, organization, and educational programs of American secondary education now and in historical perspective." The third criterion making up this average group is "knowledge of basic principles of evaluation and test construction in English," in which 64.21 percent of the teachers consider their preparation to be Superior-Good. The fourth criterion is determined to be average by the 62.16 percent of the respondents who rate themselves Superior-Good in "knowledge of principles of curriculum development in English."

The weak area under this category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English is judged to be so because 59.52 percent of the teachers surveyed rate themselves only Average-Minimal-Subminimal in knowledge of ways to teach reading in the English classroom, including corrective and developmental reading techniques. In fact, as reported in Table 8, 21.70 percent of the teachers consider themselves minimally prepared in this area. The teachers in the survey consider this qualification criterion to be their weakest area.

Table 9 presents those percentages of averages of the self-ratings of those teachers in the survey who hold bachelor's and master's degrees. No statistical tests were performed on the comparative data to determine significant differences. For this comparison, only the observed differences were noted to determine the trend. The total number of teachers involved here is 338. This is not equal to the total number of respondents in the study (341) since two of the teachers in the survey hold a doctorate and one teacher holds an advanced certificate. The comparison of group percentages was not extended beyond the bachelor's and master's because of the small number of teachers holding the advanced degrees.

TABLE 9:
PERCENTAGES OF AVERAGES OF RATINGS
OF ILLINOIS SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS
WITH BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S DEGREES
FOR THE MAJOR CATEGORIES ON THE SELF-RATING SCALE

	Superior 1.0--1.5		Good 1.6--2.5		Average 2.6--3.5		Minimal 3.6--4.5		Sub- Minimal 4.6--5.0		Not Observed		TOTAL	
	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179
Entire Rating Scale	9.43	13.40	64.15	72.06	24.52	14.52	1.88	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
Personal Qualifications	25.78	36.87	66.03	59.21	7.54	3.35	.62	.55	.00	.00	.00	.00	99.97	99.98
Knowledge of Language	16.35	21.22	44.65	49.16	28.93	24.58	8.80	4.46	1.25	.55	.00	.00	99.98	99.97
Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition	16.98	22.34	52.20	56.42	28.93	20.11	.62	1.11	1.25	.00	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
Knowledge and Skill in Literature	10.69	21.22	56.60	60.33	29.55	16.75	3.14	1.11	.00	.00	.00	.55	99.98	99.96
Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication	25.15	35.19	50.94	48.04	22.01	15.64	1.88	1.11	.00	.00	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
Knowledge and Skill in Teach-English	11.32	15.64	44.65	60.33	38.99	22.90	4.40	1.11	.62	.00	.00	.00	99.98	99.98

Just as the trend is for teachers with more years of teaching experience to rate themselves higher in the areas of Knowledge and Skill in English and in the Teaching of English, so is the trend for those teachers with more college preparation to rate themselves higher. Those teachers who have a master's degree do, in fact, tend to rate themselves higher in all of the qualifications criteria than do those teachers who have a bachelor's degree. In all instances, there is a larger percentage of teachers who hold a master's degree, or a master's degree plus graduate credit hours, who consider themselves Superior than those who have a bachelor's degree (or the BA plus). In all instances except two, the same is true for the rating of Good. At the other end of the scale, there is a larger percentage of teachers with the bachelor's degree who rate themselves Average, Minimal, or Subminimal than those who have the master's degree.

Table 9-A presents the combined percentages of averages for the two groups of teachers--those who hold the bachelor's degree and those who hold the master's degree.

TABLE 9-A: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF AVERAGES
FOR TEACHERS WITH BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S DEGREES
FOR THE MAJOR CATEGORIES ON THE SELF-RATING SCALE

	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5		Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0		Not Observed		TOTAL	
	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA
	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179
Entire Rating Scale	73.58	85.46	26.40	14.52	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
Personal Qualifications	91.81	96.08	8.16	3.90	.00	.00	99.97	99.98
Knowledge of Language	61.00	70.38	38.98	29.59	.00	.00	99.98	99.97
Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition	69.18	78.76	30.80	21.22	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
Knowledge and Skill in Literature	67.29	81.55	32.69	17.86	.00	.55	99.98	99.96
Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication	76.09	83.23	23.89	16.75	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English	55.97	75.97	44.01	24.01	.00	.00	99.98	99.98

Excluding the Entire Rating Scale and Personal Qualifications, as has been done previously, we can examine the data in Table 9-A and see that both groups of teachers consider their strongest area to be in Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication. The two groups as a whole also consider this same category as their strongest area.

The second strongest area considered by those who hold the bachelor's degree is Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition. Those who hold the master's degree consider their strongest area to be Knowledge and Skill in Literature. As a whole, the two groups consider these two areas to be equally strong.

The group of teachers holding bachelor's degrees consider their weakest area to be Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, and those with a master's degree consider their weakest area to be in Knowledge of Language. It is interesting to note that the second weakest areas for each group is simply a chiasma of the paradigm just created. The master's group considers its second weakest area to be Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, and the bachelor's group considers Knowledge of Language to be its second weakest area. As a whole, the two groups consider both areas equally weak.

Table 10 presents the percentages of ratings for the bachelor and master groupings for all the criteria that make up the rating scale. As is to be expected, because of the higher percentages of averages of the ratings of the group with master's degrees reported in Tables 9 and 9-A, there are higher percentages indicated for the master's group than for the bachelor's group in all instances for the rating of Superior. The majority of those teachers in the sample who hold a master's degree consider themselves Superior to Good in all the criteria while the majority of those who hold a bachelor's degree consider themselves Good to Average.

Tables 10-A through 10-E present the combined percentages of ratings for Superior and Good and for Average, Minimal, and Subminimal, for the two groups of teachers. As with preceding data, the data in these tables are summarized and presented in this combined fashion so that trends in the self-evaluations will be more obvious.

For the most part, the trend here is similar to the trend established by the percentages obtained on the data for the group as a whole. For example, both the master's group and the bachelor's group consider their strongest area to be that of Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication. This is also the strongest area for all the teachers. The second strongest area for those teachers with a master's degree is Knowledge and Skill in Literature, while the second strongest area for the bachelor's degree group is Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition. For the group as a whole, "literature" holds the second place and "composition" is in the third place.

TABLE 10:

PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS OF ILLINOIS
SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS WITH BACHELOR'S AND
MASTER'S DEGREES FOR EACH CRITERION ON THE SELF-RATING SCALE

Criteria	Superior		Good		Average		Minimal		Subminimal		Not Observed		TOTAL	
	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179	BA N=159	MA N=179
I. 1	44.65	54.18	44.02	35.19	10.06	8.37	1.25	2.23	.00	.00	.00	.00	99.98	99.97
2	36.47	48.04	53.45	45.25	9.43	6.14	.62	.55	.00	.00	.00	.00	99.97	99.98
3	22.64	29.05	55.34	55.86	20.75	14.52	1.25	.55	.00	.00	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
4	21.38	31.28	66.66	60.89	10.69	6.70	1.25	.55	.00	.00	.00	.55	99.98	99.97
5	40.88	42.45	45.91	43.57	11.94	11.73	1.25	.55	.00	.55	.00	1.11	99.98	99.96
6	28.30	38.54	53.45	48.60	15.72	10.61	.62	1.11	.62	.00	1.25	1.11	99.96	99.97
7	38.99	50.27	44.65	41.34	15.09	5.58	.00	.55	.62	.00	.62	2.23	99.97	99.97
II.A. 8	19.49	23.46	45.28	48.04	26.41	23.46	6.91	4.46	1.25	.55	.62	.00	99.96	99.97
9	16.35	17.31	31.44	37.98	29.55	31.28	19.49	8.93	2.51	2.23	.62	2.23	99.96	99.96
10	18.23	27.37	39.62	43.57	27.04	20.11	9.43	7.82	4.40	.55	1.25	.55	99.97	99.97
11	18.23	18.43	28.30	37.98	33.33	29.05	16.35	11.17	3.14	2.79	.62	.55	99.97	99.97
II.B. 12	35.84	51.95	51.57	41.89	10.69	5.02	1.25	.55	.62	.00	.00	.55	99.97	99.96
13	7.54	13.40	35.84	46.92	40.25	27.93	15.72	10.05	.62	1.11	.00	.55	99.97	99.96
14	24.52	29.05	45.91	45.81	27.04	22.34	1.25	1.67	1.25	.00	.00	1.11	99.97	99.98
15	17.61	29.60	49.05	52.51	30.18	16.20	1.88	1.67	1.25	.00	.00	.00	99.97	99.98
16	16.35	22.34	49.68	51.95	28.93	24.02	4.40	1.67	.62	.00	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
II.C. 17	27.67	41.34	53.45	46.36	16.98	10.61	1.25	1.11	.62	.00	.00	.55	99.97	99.97
18	32.70	50.27	42.13	36.31	20.12	8.37	5.03	3.91	.00	.55	.00	.55	99.98	99.96
19	8.17	18.43	33.96	37.98	37.10	30.72	18.86	9.49	1.25	1.11	.62	2.23	99.96	99.96
20	23.27	31.84	46.54	43.57	23.89	20.67	6.28	3.35	.00	.00	.00	.55	99.98	99.98
21	23.89	35.75	55.34	46.92	17.61	15.08	2.51	1.11	.00	.00	.62	1.11	99.97	99.97
22	8.17	10.05	32.70	44.13	35.84	33.51	18.86	10.61	3.77	1.11	.62	.55	99.96	99.96
23	23.89	32.40	40.88	43.57	30.18	20.11	3.14	2.23	.62	.55	1.25	1.11	99.96	99.97
II.D. 24	23.27	31.84	37.10	44.69	30.81	18.43	8.17	4.46	.62	.55	.00	.00	99.97	99.97
25	9.43	15.08	31.44	35.75	36.47	35.75	20.12	9.49	1.88	2.79	.62	1.11	99.96	99.97
26	38.36	44.69	45.28	41.34	15.09	13.40	1.25	.55	.00	.00	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
27	42.76	43.01	39.62	43.57	13.20	11.17	3.14	2.23	.62	.00	.62	.00	99.96	99.98
III. 28	21.38	28.49	49.05	51.95	25.78	18.99	3.14	.55	.00	.00	.62	.00	99.97	99.98
29	13.83	15.64	30.81	41.34	35.84	35.75	16.35	6.70	2.51	.55	.62	.00	99.96	99.98
30	7.54	13.40	36.47	45.25	41.50	34.63	12.57	5.02	1.88	1.11	.00	.55	99.96	99.96
31	25.78	34.07	42.13	50.27	27.67	14.52	3.77	.55	.62	.00	.00	.55	99.97	99.96
32	18.23	21.78	31.44	50.83	37.73	25.13	11.32	.55	1.25	.55	.00	1.11	99.97	99.95
33	24.52	33.51	45.91	51.39	23.27	12.84	5.03	1.11	1.25	.55	.00	.55	99.98	99.95
34	11.94	13.40	20.12	34.63	28.93	33.51	30.81	13.96	8.17	4.46	.00	.00	99.97	99.96
35	9.43	15.08	50.31	52.51	33.96	27.37	4.40	3.91	1.25	.00	.62	1.11	99.97	99.98

TABLE 10-A:

COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS
FOR CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE OF LANGUAGE

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5		Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0		Not Observed		TOTAL	
	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA
	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179
II.A. 8	64.77	71.50	34.57	28.47	.62	.00	99.96	99.97
9	47.79	55.21	51.55	42.44	.62	2.23	99.96	99.96
10	57.85	70.94	40.87	28.48	1.25	.55	99.97	99.97
11	46.53	56.41	52.82	43.01	.62	.55	99.97	99.97

TABLE 10-B:

COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS FOR
CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN WRITTEN COMPOSITION

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5		Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0		Not Observed		TOTAL	
	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA
	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179
II.B.12	87.41	93.84	12.56	5.57	.00	.55	99.97	99.96
13	43.38	60.32	56.59	39.09	.00	.55	99.97	99.96
14	70.43	74.86	29.54	24.01	.00	1.11	99.97	99.98
15	66.66	82.11	33.31	17.87	.00	.00	99.97	99.98
16	66.03	74.29	33.95	25.69	.00	.00	99.98	99.98

TABLE 10-C: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS FOR
CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN LITERATURE

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5		Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0		Not Observed		TOTAL	
	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA
	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179
II.C.17	81.12	87.70	18.85	11.72	.00	.55	99.97	99.97
18	74.83	86.58	25.15	12.83	.00	.55	99.98	99.96
19	42.13	56.41	57.21	41.32	.62	2.23	99.96	99.96
20	69.81	75.41	30.17	24.02	.00	.55	99.98	99.98
21	79.23	82.67	20.12	16.19	.62	1.11	99.97	99.97
22	40.84	54.18	58.47	45.23	.62	.55	99.96	99.96
23	64.77	75.97	33.94	22.89	1.25	1.11	99.96	99.97

TABLE 10-D: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS FOR
CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN ORAL COMMUNICATION

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5		Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0		Not Observed		TOTAL	
	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA
	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179
II.D.24	60.37	76.53	39.60	23.44	.00	.00	99.97	99.97
25	40.87	50.83	58.47	48.03	.62	1.11	99.96	99.97
26	83.64	86.03	16.34	13.95	.00	.00	99.98	99.98
27	82.38	86.58	16.96	13.40	.62	.00	99.96	99.98

TABLE 10-E: COMBINED PERCENTAGES OF RATINGS FOR
CATEGORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN TEACHING ENGLISH

Criteria	Superior- Good 1.0-2.5		Average- Minimal- Subminimal 2.6-5.0		Not Observed		TOTAL	
	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA	BA	MA
	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179	N=159	N=179
III. 28	70.43	80.44	28.82	19.54	.62	.00	99.97	99.98
29	44.64	56.98	54.70	43.00	.62	.00	99.96	99.98
30	44.01	58.65	55.95	40.76	.00	.55	99.96	99.96
31	67.91	84.34	32.06	15.07	.00	.55	99.97	99.96
32	49.67	72.61	50.30	26.23	.00	1.11	99.97	99.96
33	70.43	84.90	29.55	14.50	.00	.55	99.98	99.95
34	32.06	48.03	67.91	51.93	.00	.00	99.97	99.96
35	59.74	67.59	39.61	31.28	.62	1.11	99.97	99.98

The teachers with a master's degree consider their fourth strongest area to be Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English. Those teachers with only a bachelor's degree consider this area their weakest area. The bachelor's group considers its fourth strongest area to be Knowledge of Language. It is this area that the master's degree teachers consider their weakest area.

In comparing the combined percentages of ratings for the individual criteria for the two groups of master degree teachers and bachelor degree teachers with those percentages obtained for the group as a whole, we see that the trends for "strong," "average," and "weak" areas, for the most part, hold for all sets of percentages. There are a few instances, all of which become too complicated to list, in which certain criteria exchange their rankings. However, both groups of teachers, as does the group as a whole, consider their strongest qualification to be their "ability to recognize such characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage." Each group, and again all the teachers, considers its weakest area to be "knowledge of ways to teach reading in the English classroom, including corrective and developmental reading techniques."

DISCUSSION

Not all research yields startling information or conclusions. Occasionally inconclusive results and everyday conclusions serve as seminal ideas for further research. Then, too, some research findings serve to maintain a needed continuing awareness of certain facts in a changing world. Without an awareness of these facts, we cannot know that needed changes are taking place. Further, we must maintain an awareness of the direction of changes and of the direction of needed changes. The area of English teacher preparation is no exception.

In 1961, The National Interest and the Teaching of English reported that "deficiencies in [the preparation of teachers of English], dating back many years, have been a major cause of the crisis in English teaching now apparent throughout the country."⁵ Since 1961, some improvement has been accomplished.

The secondary school English teachers in the state of Illinois, as represented by the sample in this survey, have evaluated their knowledge in areas of the English content and the teaching of English as "Good," i.e., at a level of qualification describing competencies reasonable to expect in able or fairly able English majors whose ability and college preparation have been average or better in quality. This self-evaluation was accomplished in 1967-68. Almost fifty percent (47.21) of the teachers in the survey have taught less than seven years. Thus, many of these 161 secondary school English teachers would have graduated from college after the publication of The National Interest and the Teaching of English. And they rate their preparation in the teaching of English as Good. There is improvement there, yes; but obviously more is needed. The top of the scale is Superior.

Also, in 1961, The National Interest and the Teaching of English reported that "between 40 and 60 percent of the English in our public junior and senior high schools is being taught by teachers who lack even the minimal training required for a major in English."⁶ In 1954, Charles Willard and John D. Mees reported that 52 percent of the teachers surveyed in Illinois reported English as their major, and an additional 14 percent majored in a combination of English, speech, and journalism.⁷

In 1964, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English reported that 50.5 percent of those teaching secondary school English held an undergraduate major in English and that 22.6 percent held a minor in English, a total of 73.1 percent.⁸

In 1967-68, 76.83 percent of the respondents in the survey of Illinois secondary school English teachers reported English as their major. Further, 17.59 percent of the teachers reported having English as a minor. Thus, 94.42 percent of the sample had a major or minor in English. Only 5.57 percent of the teachers sampled reported a subject other than English as their major or minor. Again, some improvement; but more is needed. The top of the scale is one hundred percent.

In 1961, The National Interest and the Teaching of English set forth "A Standard of Preparation to Teach English." In 1965, ISCPET set forth its Preliminary Statement of Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of

English. In 1968, the NASDTEC-MLA-NCTE English Teacher Preparation Study set forth its Guidelines. In all three instances, those responsible for the Statements subscribed, summarily, to the "hope that the teacher of English (1) has the personal qualities which make an effective teacher, (2) has received a well-balanced education, including knowledge of a foreign language and a basic grounding in science, mathematics, the social sciences, and the arts, (3) has received the appropriate training in psychology and professional education, and (4) has dedicated himself to humanistic values."⁹

Although ISCPET's Preliminary Statement of Qualifications does not list the necessary personal qualities of an effective teacher, there is a consensus that the list would incorporate such varied items as integrity, willingness to work hard, liking for children, and a pleasant voice. The list would continue until it became a catalog of virtues desirable in any human being. One teacher's comment puts it practically, "A genuine liking for adolescents and a desire to help them are also necessary ingredients for successful teaching. If one dislikes his students, he will do a poor job. Also, one should thoroughly enjoy teaching and not do it just to earn a salary."

ISCPET's Illinois Teacher Rating Scale does, however, list seven items under the category of Personal Qualifications. These seven items attempt to cover that 'catalog' perhaps too generally and perhaps too summarily. Nevertheless, these seven items serve their purpose on the Rating Scale if only to cause the individual who is rating himself to think of himself, objectively and subjectively, in terms of some personality characteristics and of what is humanly possible in being human.

Those teachers who responded to the survey of Illinois secondary school English teachers consider their strongest Personal Qualifications to be "professional relationships: cooperation, dependability, tact," and "mental alertness, judgment." In both instances, ninety percent of the teachers rated themselves Superior-Good. In all the other five criteria making up this category, eighty percent of the teachers rated themselves Superior-Good. In comparison, since 18.17 percent of the teachers rated themselves Average-Minimal-Subminimal on "creativity, imagination, resourcefulness," it is this quality that stands most in need of improvement. Those teachers in the sample who hold the master's degree consider their strongest personal qualities to be "professional relationships: cooperation, dependability, tact," "mental alertness, judgment," and "initiative, perseverance--all with percentages in the nineties. In comparison, teachers in the sample consider fairly weak their "creativity, imagination, resourcefulness" (15.07 percent for Average-Minimal-Subminimal). Although those teachers in the survey who hold the bachelor's degree report lower percentages for the rating of Superior-Good, they generally follow the same trend as set by the master's degree group. Those who hold the bachelor's degree consider themselves less creative, imaginative, and resourceful than those who hold the master's degree. Because of the small percentages establishing this quality as a "weak" area, this merely points out that teaching secondary school English is in fact a challenge. A few teachers in the sample consider themselves only Good or Average in meeting this challenge. In no instances, however, does any teacher consider himself Minimal or Subminimal for any of the criteria making up the Personal Qualifications. It is interesting to note, however, that the correlation of $-.23$ obtained for the average of ratings for Personal

Qualifications with the years of teaching experience is the lowest obtained for all the major categories on the Rating Scale. Almost all studies concerned with personal qualities and effective teaching yield inconclusive results; yet there is some evidence that dogmatism among teachers increases with years of experience. There is something indeed to work on: to become less dogmatic and more creative. One teacher's comment is of interest here. "I enjoy teaching English very much. It is a constant challenge. It requires creativity, mental alertness, and sensitivity to other people. In return, teaching provides intellectual stimulation and human warmth. (Trite though this may seem, I feel that it is my love of teaching that makes me a good teacher.)"

In 1961, it was observed that "...most of the English majors who were graduated in June, 1960, and are now teaching in high school are simply not equipped either to deal with problems of teaching the language and composition or to keep up with current developments in the application of linguistics to the teaching of English. Unhappily, what is true of the class of 1960 is no less true of previous classes and hence of the great body of teachers now in English classrooms; and it likely will be true of future graduating classes for some time unless the normally slow sequence of events can be modified."¹⁰ Again, on a national level, but in 1964, it was reported that "almost half [the secondary teachers responding to the survey] are insecure [in their preparation] in literature and language."¹¹

And what of Illinois in 1967-68? On all four criteria under the major category of Knowledge of Language, over fifty percent of the teachers rate themselves Superior-Good in preparation. As stated earlier, though, the areas most in need of improvement are those of being familiar with at least two systems of English grammar and of knowing the history of the English language. An examination of the comments made by some of the teachers on the Rating Scale indicates that most of the knowledge that the teachers have gained in this area has come from personal study and experience. Many teachers commented that there were no formal courses in grammars or history of the language offered or required at their universities. Several teachers indicated that they had received formal instruction in these areas by attending NDEA summer institutes. Only a few teachers (probably the ones with fewer years of teaching experience) reported that they had had course work in language for their bachelor's degree. Many teachers made the comment that they could use a "review" course or would benefit from courses in these areas.

The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English in 1964 reported that on a national level slightly more than one-third (36.6 percent) of secondary school English teachers considered themselves prepared to teach composition.¹² In Illinois, in 1967-68, 74.47 percent of the teachers responding to the survey consider themselves Superior-Good in preparation in Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition. Under this major category of composition, the Illinois teachers consider their strongest area to be the ability to recognize good writing. This ability could well stem from a great deal of reading of good writing, from having to be good critics of literature. The Illinois teachers consider their weakest area in this category to be knowledge of theories and history of rhetoric and of the development of English prose. This deficiency could well be linked with the reported weakness in the area of knowledge of the history of the English language.

Although the percentages run rather high for those teachers in the sample who rate themselves Superior-Good in written composition, it should be noted that there is not a criterion asking the teachers to rate themselves on their "ability to teach composition." Also, important to note here is a sampling of some of the comments, a summary of which indicates that this high proficiency in written composition has come from self-study on the parts of the teachers involved and not necessarily as a result of previous pre-service or in-service course work. Although some teachers commented that they had received valuable training in NDEA institutes, in summer course work at various universities, and from superb and experienced college supervisors and high school critic teachers, others reported that the knowledge and skill in composition had come as a result of a great deal of reading and many years of teaching experience. A few teachers noted that they themselves are published authors, and others reported that they are better critics than creators. Many of the comments indicated that much more on how to teach composition should be given in the college courses for prospective English teachers.

On a national level, according to The National Interest and the Teaching of English, secondary school English teachers feel far more confident about teaching literature than they do about teaching either language or composition. This only stands to reason; after all, the prospective teacher on the average has had far more courses in literature than in language and composition combined. In Illinois, the National Interest statement holds true except for two items included on the Rating Scale. The teachers in the Illinois survey consider themselves fairly weak in major works of selected foreign writers, both ancient and modern, and of comparative literature, and in major critical theories and schools of critical theories and schools of criticism. In both these instances, less than fifty percent of the Illinois teachers consider themselves Superior-Good in preparation. The National Interest reported that, in their 1960 survey, "only slightly more than one-third of the colleges require world literature and only one-fifth contemporary literature. Both are areas in which secondary schools provide many offerings."¹³ The report continues that "only 29.1 percent of students planning to teach in high school with a major in English are required to complete a course in literary criticism or in the critical analysis of literature."¹⁴ Illinois was a part of that national survey, and the results are showing up. A comment made by one of the respondents is of particular interest here.

This past summer I was fortunate to have been selected for an NDEA institute. This was the best educational and professional experience of my career as an English teacher. In addition to the two courses, Literary Criticism and Rhetoric and Theory in Practice, the workshop at the end of the institute helped me greatly. I recommend this type of concentrated study to all English teachers.

Again, on a national scale, but this time in 1964, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English reported that 51.9 percent of the sampled teachers consider themselves "well prepared" in literature.¹⁵

In the Illinois survey of secondary school English teachers, 75.06 percent of the teachers consider their knowledge and skill in literature to be Superior-Good. The results of this 1967-68 survey are similar to those found by the 1960 survey used by The National Interest and the Teaching of English in that the weakest areas in literature are those including world and comparative literature and knowledge of literary criticism.

The Illinois teachers consider their strongest area to be knowledge of the important works of major English and American authors; knowledge of the characteristics of various genres and of major works in English and American literature in the genres. An interesting comment made by one of the responding teachers, who most likely was strong in this area but perhaps weak in others, suggests that we now have too narrow an undergraduate curriculum: "Contrary to what universities suggest, English and American authors are not the only literate people in the world. Nor is a critical study the only 'method' or approach." Another interesting comment reads: "A muddled undergraduate program left me feeling inadequate in development of both depth and breadth of reading."

Many of the comments on "knowledge of major works of selected foreign writers, both ancient and modern, and of comparative literature" indicated that the teachers felt that much more needs to be done for this area in the undergraduate curriculum. Similar comments were made for "knowledge of major critical theories and schools of criticism" and for "knowledge of a considerable body of literature suitable for adolescents." For the latter area, many comments indicated that "suitable" is the rub and that far more training is needed in the use of contemporary materials.

Secondary school English teachers, as represented by this sample, consider themselves well prepared in the area of Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication. However, in 1964, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English reported that only 32.7 percent of the nation's English teachers feel well prepared to teach whatever oral skills may be demanded by a school's program.¹⁶ The Illinois teachers, as represented by a percentage of 46.32 rating themselves Superior-Good, consider their weakest criterion in this area to be "knowledge of current information relative to listening techniques." Their two strong areas, both indicated by 84.74 percent rating themselves Superior-Good, are the "abilities to speak clearly and effectively and to read aloud well enough to convey most aspects of the interpretive art." Several of the comments made by the responding Illinois teachers indicate that they feel there is a definite need for prospective English teachers to have training in oral interpretation and public speaking.

In reporting that English teachers consider themselves weak in teaching oral skills, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English also reported that only 10.1 percent of the teachers feel well prepared to teach reading.¹⁷ Under the category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, Illinois teachers also consider this their weakest area. Only 40.45 percent of the Illinois respondents consider themselves Superior-Good in "knowledge of ways to teach reading in the English classroom, including corrective and developmental reading techniques."

Many of the comments under this major category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English indicate that much of the preparation for these areas comes from experience and from wide reading in diverse areas such as psychology, anthropology, linguistics, and philosophy. The comments also support the statement that a methods course which is taught by a competent instructor is a very valuable part of the preparation of prospective English teachers.

The National Interest and the Teaching of English strongly supports the methods course by stating that if teachers complete only a course in general methods of teaching or no course at all, they have little opportunity to develop vital understandings about the language development of young people, the psychology of subject matter pertaining to English, and what is known from research and experience about the teaching of literature, language, and composition.¹⁸

The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English reported that 89.4 percent of the teachers in its sample reported an interest in studying practical methods of teaching English. Further, "in rating high the value of a specialized methods course, the teachers implied their lack of familiarity with contemporary findings in the psychology of learning and in new developments in language learning. Experimentation with the modern methods of organizing instruction, through introduction of such administrative arrangements as team teaching, programmed instruction, and organization of classes into special groups, would be more in evidence if teachers were thoroughly informed about them."¹⁹

Under the major category of Knowledge and Skill in the Teaching of English, the Illinois teachers surveyed consider their strongest area to be "knowledge of effective ways to teach English, to select and adapt methods and materials for the varying interests and maturity levels of students, and to develop a sequence of assignments to guide and stimulate students in their study of language, written and oral communication, and literature." Of the Illinois teachers sampled, 78.29 percent rate themselves Superior-Good on this criterion.

Comments concerning education and methods courses made by some of the responding teachers follow.

Education courses were useless at my university. In addition to student teaching, I have 15 hours (team) in education. Not one thing I was 'taught' has related to my present teaching. Surely, teachers must learn how to teach. But, as long as education courses are at their present widespread low level, the English teacher would do better to take more subject courses than to waste precious time on worthless courses. I hope Illinois' education courses are better than [state]'s.

I believe I have had an adequate educational background, but I do believe that college could have offered more methods of instruction. Graduate school has disillusioned me. I want to be a good high school teacher, yet I find graduate school pushing me farther

away from what I teach. Instead of showing what's new for me to teach, I feel I am being molded into a research hermit and am tired of being told, "Now you wouldn't teach this in high school." Why don't our colleges offer us materials that could really help us to be better high school teachers?

I consider my education at [university] a valuable experience, but I received no realistic training for being a teacher except for my student teaching, during which time I was guided by an excellent college supervisor. I feel that 90% of my present teaching ability is due to my seeking improved and creative methods. When are our universities going to prepare us for the classroom?

I found many of the principles I learned in college impractical and only theories, mostly non-useable. The actual teaching experience is just that . . . no textbook, Psych. Professor, or Educ. Prof. can solve or tell one how to solve the problem. Therefore I do not put much value on many of the courses required for the teaching certificate since they offer no useable quality to the teacher. Courses should be taught to be useable by the student - future teacher - teacher.

The more classroom experience you can provide for the student, the better. My only experiences in the classroom as a student came with student teaching plus minor exposure the previous semester in English methods. The student needs to observe a variety of methods after he has become familiar with material being taught.

In hiring teachers, the principal and I are constantly looking for and rarely finding teachers of English who have knowledge of reading techniques; methods for slow learners; adequate background in American, English, and World literature; training in transformational grammar; and thorough preparation in advanced composition.

Ninety percent of the education courses required by [university] (or whoever ultimately requires them) are a waste of time. This time could be put to use by more intensive courses in one's major field. More time should be spent on teaching 'thinking processes,' helping students realize the inter-relation of concepts in literature.

Comments made on two criteria under the major category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English are of particular interest. The numerous critical comments made on the criterion of "knowledge of the philosophy, organization, and educational programs of American secondary education now and in historical perspective" should cause those concerned with teacher preparation curriculums to re-examine this area of knowledge and its relevance. The comments which follow are representative of the consensus.

I am not convinced that such knowledge is necessary to my teaching of English. I would rate superior in knowledge of the philosophy and organization of the teaching of English.

I'm not convinced of the importance of this area for teaching English.

This general field will be marked low by many teachers without any sense of guilt.

The second criterion under this major category which received perhaps more comments than any other criterion on the Rating Scale is that of "knowledge of ways to teach reading in the English classroom, including corrective and developmental reading techniques." By far, the majority of the comments were pleas for help. Many teachers commented that they had had no training in this area, that at many universities neither the English nor the education departments provided any training in this area, and that in many instances, where training was provided, it was inadequate. Many of the comments indicated that the teachers sampled felt a definite need for instruction in this area during their preparation for teaching English.

Many of the Illinois teachers in the sample were critical of their preparation in English as well as in education. Although some of the following comments treat specifics such as grammar or composition, they are presented here because of their general significance for the entire preparatory curriculum for English teachers.

Why aren't the colleges offering more linguistics to students who are preparing to be English teachers?

As I teach, I am rapidly gaining more command in [Literature]; my college preparation gave me a good background from which to expand. I feel very inadequate in [Language], so that if I am to teach it, I will have to do a considerable amount of reading-- I have no time to do this. Therefore, I am not teaching it adequately at all. Help!

Recently, I discussed grammar and composition with several beginning teachers. These teachers were afraid to begin units of comparison and grammar, for they said that they had never had any college courses which showed or taught them how to teach these units to high school students. If our college graduates are not taught these skills, the beginning

teacher is not going to be able to prepare students for college work. Because I was interested in writing as a career, I took all writing courses that were available--journalism, creative writing, advanced writing, et cetera. Colleges need a course of High School Composition as well as High School Literature.

In teaching literature and in getting my students to think, I feel fairly competent. In composition I feel inadequate because I expect a great deal of myself. However, after talking with and watching other teachers, I'm convinced that almost all of us are inadequate in composition. I rated myself on a relative scale. On an absolute scale, I would lower my ratings.

At [university] there seems to be a burdensome emphasis on the study of English literature, which obviously creates a void in general world literature.

Since at the secondary level, much must be done in the study of grammar, I feel that courses in grammar should be required.

I believe these areas [Knowledge of Language] to be sadly neglected in preparation of English majors. Most ability in this area [Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition] seems to be developed through experience!

If all schools (colleges and universities) are preparing their English majors and minors to teach no better than the schools I'm familiar with, all beginning English teachers have a long and difficult (time-wise) period of self-preparation before them. The myriad of literature courses, although essential, simply do not prepare a person to teach. Emphases should be placed on grammar studies, semantics, history of language, and the teaching of reading, and not so much on the study of literary work.

A teacher of composition is not competing for a popularity vote! The mark of one's success is noted during the year following a student's baptism with fire in the intricacies of using his native language. Rewards are greatest during fall visits home from college--"Gee, thanks for being so strict last year! I'm rating B's while my buddy--who got A's last year with Miss Easier Teacher--is struggling for C!" or--from a business executive who really knows his son is worthy of JAMES Honors, "We are so grateful for your encouragement of our son; you really started him on his way!" Not really. I merely got out of his way and let him get on with

his business of learning to judge writers and to practice his own skill at writing.

How can one move one's department into the teaching of relevant subject matter when the teachers have not had any college courses on this material? Most of them have taught for years without going back to school. Most of them do not read professional publications (though they are available). Most of them think I'm a little crazy because I am teaching historical linguistics, dialectology, et cetera. They prefer direct objects and sentence diagrams and teaching Silas Marner word by word. Will someone write me an answer?

Comments made on the criteria under the major category of Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition generally indicate that teachers feel they were taught composition, but not how to teach composition. Several teachers commented that all their knowledge of composition was obtained through self-study because their college curriculums stressed literature to the complete exclusion of any courses on composition.

Many of the comments made on the literature category indicate that a number of the teachers in the sample feel an intense frustration in view of the great many works that must be read. A representative comment is, "I've developed my critical faculties, but I haven't quite caught up with all the works themselves."

One teacher said that most of his practice teachers are woefully weak in such backgrounds of English and American literature as history, the Bible, mythology, and folklore, and they then miss much of the meaning of some literary masterpieces.

Several comments made on the criterion of "knowledge of a considerable body of literature suitable for adolescents" pointed out the difficulty in the word "suitable." Also, several teachers commented that more training in this area and in the use of contemporary materials is needed.

The comments under the major category of language indicate that this is an area comparable to composition, that is, that much of the knowledge that the teachers do have is knowledge gained through self-instruction.

What knowledge I have in the areas under Language
I have picked up on my own by reading extensively.

During my undergraduate and graduate work for the
M.A., these studies were not stressed.

Many of the comments that were made on the criterion of "knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar" indicate that traditional grammar is really the only grammar known well, that some teachers have an inkling of another system but do not know it well enough to use in their teaching, and that many teachers feel a definite need for more courses at the college level dealing with the various grammars.

Many of the teachers who completed the Rating Scale had their own recommendations and suggestions for the preparation of prospective secondary school English teachers and for the improvement of college curriculums. For the most part, the comments focus on improved or added courses in how to teach English, how to teach composition, and (with much emphasis) how to teach reading. A sampling of these comments follows:

I think the points you have listed [the Qualifications Statement] are indeed valid. My only suggestion is that colleges and universities perhaps do some work in teaching prospective teachers how to feel and react to the world and life outside the Ivy Walls. The hardest thing for any new teacher to confront as a beginner is to the reality which we're conditioned not to recognize when in school. Good luck!

I recommend that all teachers on the secondary level be required to obtain a master's degree in from 3 to 5 years after teaching; that English minors who are teaching English be required to complete a major, and that English teachers be given no more than four classes.

I feel that competency in at least one foreign language should be a requirement for an English teacher. I am glad that you have listed that as one of the requirements.

I suggest for preparation for future teachers:
Knowledge and Skill in Audio-Visual Aids.

I feel that while [university] tried to give me an adequate preparation, I personally needed to teach before the materials "jelled" for me and made sense. I knew things, but I had to learn to relate them. Actual classroom work forced me to do this.

Having graduated recently, I find my preparation unusual in that I was taught only traditional grammar. I had no instruction whatsoever in the complex art of teaching (i. e., motivation, discipline techniques, test construction and evaluation, methods or organization.) I now appreciate the need for some familiarity with "teenage literature" - an area which received no mention in my preparation.

As a first year teacher, I find there is quite a difference between the preparation I had and being able to apply it to a classroom situation. I feel that I have had excellent preparation for teaching English, but some things that should work in theory

just don't always work in practice. It seems to become a matter of trying different things to see just what will be successful with each class.

I have been teaching three months. I find the English department here has no satisfactory reading program and am in the process of initiating a better program in my own classes (of remedial reading ability students) as well as setting up a program for the department--with the aid of other teachers. I had one semester of remedial reading instruction and it has proved totally inadequate in preparing me for the above task.

I feel that the preparation of English teachers needs to have a special course of study for those interested in junior high teaching. As a seventh grade teacher, I feel inadequately trained. My background in secondary English did not include phonics or beginning reading techniques to help me help my remedial students. Somewhere near graduation the prospective teachers should also become familiar with audio-visual equipment and techniques for effectively using these machines. Those of us who try to do a good job need all the help we can get to acquaint us with materials and sources for later obtaining materials. One of the most commendable acts the English department did for me was to introduce me to N.C.T.E. and I.A.T.E. These two organizations have kept me advised of new materials.

You didn't ask me whether I thought I was a good English teacher. I'm probably not because I don't know what English teachers are supposed to do well. I never have time to really figure out whether what I'm teaching is getting across. The burden of paper correcting, class preparation and test construction leaves little time for evaluation. I'd love to spend about five years learning how to teach someday, but I'm too busy doing it, to learn how. This is a plea for courses in "How to Teach English" at our universities. I've had enough literature courses. I need practical help, not brotherly consolation.

Senior English and Guidance, particularly for the College Bound, go hand-in-hand. My year as an instructor of Freshman College English (while I was getting my Master's degree in Guidance) was an invaluable aid to my teaching of high school English. My many hours in speech and dramatics pays off in the classroom, too.

I have learned most from my association with a dynamic, knowledgeable department chairman and least in college (undergraduate course). Graduate school developed my knowledge of literature and my personal writing abilities.

More emphasis in university preparation is needed in the following areas: Reading (teaching of); composition; worthwhile methods; personal qualities of maturity; good judgment; responsibility to everyone--students as well as colleagues; professional ethics. Thanks for the opportunity to help.

I feel my preparation was far better than that of most teachers I know. However, it was extremely weak in grammar and composition.

The biggest improvement I could suggest in teacher preparation would be the inclusion of a one year apprenticeship at partial pay. The training program would naturally be expanded from four to five years. I feel actual classroom experience is the best preparation any teacher can have.

From my observation of student teachers and first year teachers, I feel my liberal arts college background prepared me better for teaching than what has been done for other teachers in very specialized course work at larger universities.

Colleges, please help our teacher-training program in teaching reading (remedial and developmental).

The greatest weakness in my preparation is the fact that in no way was the teaching of reading in the secondary school included in the curriculum. This seriously handicaps any teacher because we always have a few students who need instruction, and we are helpless.

In addition, only one quarter of American literature was required of an English major. This was to be a survey course, and it was taught in eight weeks. Obviously, the preparation was poor for a teacher of junior English in the high school. I hope this has been corrected by now.

I feel my preparation in literature is adequate. I do believe a course in "world" literature valuable. There are many classics not English or American that everyone should know something about. A course in schools of criticism is invaluable in giving a broadened outlook on "good" versus "bad" and "acceptable" versus "non-acceptable" pieces of literature, and modes of interpretation. I had about one week of language history (3 clock hours), which is enough only to say such a thing exists. Modern linguistics helps understand principles of change, but does not in itself prepare me to read Chaucer. I feel my knowledge of psychology and education principles to be superior, but get very discouraged in applying them. I could have used a course on mechanics of writing, teaching the act of, and how to grade themes.

I believe that my training in English education "hedged around." We never quite got down to discussing how and what to teach. We spent entire sessions talking about how to grade a composition but never talked about how to write a composition. In our reading course, for instance, we only skimmed the surface but never learned how to help a child who is seventeen and has a sixth grade reading ability. Medical schools do not send doctors into hospitals without concrete, practical learning. Why do universities do this with teachers?

CONCLUSIONS

ISCPET's Illinois Teacher Rating Scale for Experienced English Teachers sought the answers to three specific questions:

- 1) How do experienced secondary school English teachers rate themselves in areas of Knowledge of English and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English?
- 2) Is there a significant relationship or correlation between the self-evaluations of experienced secondary school English teachers and the number of years of teaching experience?
- 3) Do teachers who hold a master's degree consistently rate themselves higher than do teachers who hold the bachelor's degree?

The conclusions of this study are based on the results of a 57% return of the completed Rating Scales. The population of the study is made up of experienced secondary school English teachers in Illinois, selected randomly from membership listings of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English and the National Council of Teachers of English.

The largest percentage of secondary school English teachers in the sample (26.39) teach in Illinois high schools with enrollments ranging from 1,001 to 2,000. The second most represented size of school is that having an enrollment of below 500 students. Almost twenty-one percent of the teachers sampled teach in small high schools and almost nineteen percent teach in schools with enrollments of from 501 to 1,000.

By far the majority of the teachers in the sample were English majors. Two hundred sixty-two of the 341 teachers, a percentage of 76.83, reported having a major in English, while 17.59 percent reported having only an English minor. A very small percentage of the teachers in the survey, 5.57 percent, reported having neither a major nor a minor in English.

Just over half the teachers sampled (52.49%) reported having a master's degree, and 46.63 percent reported having a bachelor's degree. Two teachers in the sample held the doctorate and one teacher held an advanced certificate.

The range of number of college credit hours beyond the highest degree is from zero hours to 41 hours. College credit hours in this survey included both English and non-English courses. Sixty-five teachers in the sample (19.23%) reported having no credit hours beyond the highest degree. The most represented ten-hour-interval of credit hours is from eleven to twenty hours credit, represented by a percentage of 24.55%.

The years of teaching experience represented by the survey ranged from only three months to forty-five years. Over half the teachers sampled (63.93%) have taught less than ten years. The years of teaching experience most represented in the survey is three, as reported by 24.34 percent of the teachers.

On the basis of the data obtained in this survey, teachers with more years of teaching experience do in fact tend to rate themselves higher in given areas of knowledge in English and knowledge and skill in the teaching of English than do those teachers who have less experience. Further, teachers with a master's degree, or above, tend to rate themselves higher in those same given areas than do teachers with a bachelor's degree.

Overall, secondary school English teachers in this survey consider their professional competency in Knowledge of English and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English to be "Good"--the competency reasonable to expect in able or fairly able English majors whose ability and college preparation have been average or better in quality. The teachers consider their strongest major category to be Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication and their weakest major categories to be Knowledge of Language and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English.

Under the category of Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication, the teachers consider their strongest area to be the "ability to read aloud well enough to convey most aspects of the interpretive art: meaning, mood, dominant emotions, varying emotions, overtones, and variety."

The respondents' weakest area, under the category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, is "knowledge of ways to teach reading in the English classroom, including corrective and developmental reading techniques." Under the category of Knowledge of Language, the two equally weak areas are "knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar" and "knowledge of the history of the English language."

The Illinois teachers in this survey consider their strongest individual qualification to be the "ability to recognize characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage," and the weakest individual qualification is considered to be "knowledge of ways to teach reading."

A larger percentage of teachers with master's degrees rate themselves Superior on the rating scale than do those teachers with bachelor's degrees. The majority of the bachelor degree teachers rate themselves Good. For all the major categories, the group with a bachelor's degree considers its weakest area to be Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, as did the group as a whole, but those teachers with a master's degree consider their weakest area to be Knowledge of Language. Also similar to the group as a whole, each group of teachers considers its strongest area to be Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations made as a result of this study fall under two categories: additional research and corrective measures.

Several years from now a study similar to the one being reported should be undertaken. Not only should this recommended study seek experienced English teachers' self-evaluations on areas of knowledge of English and knowledge and skill in teaching English, but the study should seek more biographical and status data of teachers, teaching conditions, and teacher preparation.

Data should be obtained on items such as daily teaching schedule, number of students met per day, types of classes or subjects taught, graduate work completed in English courses and in non-English courses, year last degree was obtained, recency of college course work, school duties other than teaching, salary and conditions with which Illinois teachers are dissatisfied.

Statistics of this sort are quickly outdated. Changes in requirements for teacher preparation, teaching load, teachers' salaries, and in-service education are constantly being recommended. We need a means of determining when and where changes are being made in Illinois.

Numerous changes in the college curriculums of both English and education departments have taken place in Illinois within the past five years. Several of the twenty ISCPET participating institutions have almost completely reorganized their English teacher preparatory curriculums. Some have added the needed additional courses in composition, linguistics, history of the English language, grammars, adolescent literature, and literary criticism, as well as methods courses specifically for English and taught by English and/or English education professors. In effect, many of the ISCPET institutions have already taken the necessary action to correct most of the weaknesses in English and in the teaching of English reported in this study. However, in order to determine if improvement has been effected, a survey to obtain the self-evaluations of the graduates of these programs needs to be undertaken after those graduates have had an opportunity to teach several years.

Under the second heading of corrective measures, the recommendations can be made in two areas: pre-service and in-service training.

Necessary steps need to be taken in the pre-service curriculum for the prospective secondary school English teacher in order to give him more "knowledge and skill in the teaching of English." Although it is expected that a certain amount of this knowledge comes only from several years of actual teaching experience, perhaps in that pre-service curriculum more advantage can be taken of micro-teaching, simulation-teaching, longer student teaching experiences, and more applicable, stringent, and challenging professional education and teaching methods courses.

More course work needs to be offered at the undergraduate level in language, linguistics, and the application of linguistics to teaching English. More course work is needed in literary criticism, theories of literary criticism, the history of rhetoric and the development of English prose. Also, more course work needs to be made available in comparative literature,

literary backgrounds such as the Bible, mythology and folklore, and literature for adolescents. More than the traditional two-semester sequence of courses in freshman composition needs to be offered. In addition, a course on how to teach composition would be extremely beneficial.

Prospective English teachers need the availability of courses in adolescent literature and courses in the teaching of reading.

A well-designed course in the teaching of reading in the secondary school should be offered jointly by departments of English and education. A course such as this should be language-literature oriented, but primarily concerned with methods of teaching reading, theories of reading, corrective and developmental reading techniques, as well as other important areas of the teaching of reading. The course should be offered in conjunction with other courses such as adolescent literature, psychology of language, and the history and development of the English language.

Similarly, necessary steps need to be taken to insure availability of and a proper sequence in in-service education programs. For example, those teachers in the survey who hold the master's degree consider themselves weaker than the bachelor degree teachers in Knowledge of Language. The emphasis on language and linguistics in the college curriculum of the recent bachelor degree graduates needs also to be placed in the in-service educational programs of teachers who graduated from college, pre-language emphasis.

New developments in English, learning, and teaching as well as research findings should be made readily available for in-service education programs. There should be a state-supported in-service educational program that would insure that appropriate and needed programs are available and are taking place at schools throughout the state. Effective means should be found to encourage all teachers to participate in professional organizations, to support, conduct and participate in in-service education programs, and to return to college as often as possible for continued study in English and in the teaching of English.

SUMMARY

This study was designed to determine how experienced secondary school English teachers in Illinois rate themselves in areas of Knowledge of English and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English. The study also sought to determine if there were a significant relationship or correlation between those self-evaluations and the number of years of teaching experience. Further, the study attempted to determine if there were a significant relationship between those self-evaluations and the college degrees held by the teacher.

ISCPET's Illinois Self-Rating Scale for Experienced English Teachers (Form G) was developed for use in this survey. This Rating Scale was based on previously developed ISCPET Illinois Teacher Rating Scales (Forms A through F) and on ISCPET's Preliminary Statement of Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English. The Rating Scale asks a teacher to rate himself on a scale of from 1 to 5, representing Superior to Subminimal, on thirty-five criteria.

In mid-November, 1967, Form G was distributed to 600 secondary school English teachers in Illinois, randomly selected from the membership listings of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English and of the secondary section of the National Council of Teachers of English. Careful records were maintained of the distribution lists, and duplications were avoided. By late December, 1967, 341 completed Rating Scales had been received, representing a 57% return.

The largest percentage of secondary school English teachers in the sample (26.39%) teach in Illinois high schools with enrollments ranging from 1,001 to 2,000. The second most represented size of school is that having an enrollment of below 500 students. Almost twenty-one percent of the teachers sampled teach in small high schools and almost nineteen percent teach in schools with enrollments of from 501 to 1,000.

By far, the majority of the teachers in the sample were English majors. Two hundred sixty-two of the 341 teachers, a percentage of 76.83, reported having a major in English, while 17.59 percent reported having only an English minor. A very small percentage of the teachers in the survey, 5.57 percent, reported having neither a major nor a minor in English.

Just over half the teachers sampled (52.49%) reported having a master's degree, and 46.63 percent reported having a bachelor's degree. Two teachers in the sample held the doctorate and one teacher held an advanced certificate.

The range of number of college credit hours beyond the highest degree is from zero hours to 41 hours. College credit hours in this survey included both English and non-English courses. Sixty-five teachers in the sample (19.23%) reported having no credit hours beyond the highest degree. The most represented ten-hour-interval of credit hours is that one of from eleven to twenty hours credit, represented by a percentage of 24.55%.

The years of teaching experience represented by the survey ranged from only three months to forty-five years. Over half the teachers sampled (63.93%) have taught less than ten years. The years of teaching experience

most represented in the survey is three, as reported by 24.34 percent of the teachers.

On the basis of the data obtained in this survey, teachers with more years of teaching experience do in fact tend to rate themselves higher in given areas of Knowledge of English and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English. Further, teachers with a master's degree, or above, tend to rate themselves higher in those same given areas than do teachers with a bachelor's degree.

A larger percentage of teachers with master's degrees rate themselves Superior on the Rating Scale than do those teachers with bachelor's degrees. The majority of the bachelor degree teachers rate themselves Good. The group with a bachelor's degree considers its weakest area to be Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, as did the group as a whole, but those teachers with a master's degree consider their weakest area to be Knowledge of Language. Also similar to the group as a whole, both groups of teachers consider their strongest area to be in Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication.

Overall, secondary school English teachers in this survey consider their professional competency in Knowledge of English and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English to be "Good"--the competency reasonable to expect in able or fairly able English majors whose ability and college preparation have been average or better in quality. The teachers consider their strongest major category to be Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication and their weakest major categories to be Knowledge of Language and Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English.

Under the category of Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication, the teachers consider their strongest criterion to be the "ability to read aloud well enough to convey most aspects of the interpretive art: meaning, mood, dominant emotions, varying emotions, overtones, and variety." The respondents' weakest criterion, under the category of Knowledge and Skill in Teaching English, is "knowledge of ways to teach reading in the English classroom, including corrective and developmental reading techniques." Under the category of Knowledge of Language, the two equally weak criteria are "knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar" and "knowledge of the history of the English language."

The Illinois teachers in the survey consider their strongest individual qualification to be the "ability to recognize characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage," and the weakest individual qualification is considered to be "knowledge of ways to teach reading."

An examination of the self-evaluations of the teachers in this survey and of the comments and suggestions made by many of these teachers indicates that the preparatory curriculum for prospective English teachers needs to include more courses in language, linguistics, and the application of linguistics to teaching English, literary criticism, theories of literary criticism, the history of rhetoric, and the development of English prose. More than the traditional two-semester sequence of courses in freshman composition needs to be offered. Further, courses in how to teach composition need to be offered. As well, courses in adolescent literature and courses on how to teach reading should be offered.

Effective means should be found for making available in-service educational programs on new developments in English, learning, and teaching as well as research findings in English. Effective means should be found to encourage all teachers to participate in professional organizations, to support, conduct and participate in in-service education programs, and to return to college as often as possible for continued study in English and in the teaching of English.

Replication of this study is recommended in order to determine the effect of changes now taking place in many of the Illinois colleges and university curriculums for prospective secondary school English teachers.

REFERENCES

1. For a complete list and description of ISCPET's Special Research Studies see Issues in the Preparation of Teachers of English, Raymond D. Crisp (ed.), Urbana, Ill.: ISCPET, University of Illinois Press, November 1967.
2. J. N. Hook, "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," College English, 27 (November 1965), 166-169.
3. Ibid., p. 166.
4. Joan Harris, "Report on the Teaching of English in Illinois Public High Schools," Illinois English Bulletin, 54 (October 1966), 1-22, and John M. Heissler, "The Teaching of English in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine in the State of Illinois," reported in Current Research in English Teacher Preparation: A First Report, Raymond D. Crisp (ed.), Urbana, Ill.: ISCPET, University of Illinois Press, January 1968.
5. The Committee on National Interest, The National Interest and the Teaching of English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961, p. 26.
6. Ibid., p. 36.
7. Charles Willard and John D. Mees, "A Study of the Preparation of Present Teachers of English in Illinois and Their Recommendations for an Improved Training Program," Illinois English Bulletin, Vol. 41, No. 8 (May 1954), p. 9.
8. The Committee on National Interest, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964, pp. 20-22.
9. The National Interest and the Teaching of English, op. cit., p. 40.
10. Ibid., p. 75.
11. The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English, op. cit., p. 20.
12. Ibid., p. 25.
13. The National Interest and the Teaching of English, op. cit., p. 81.
14. Ibid., p. 82.
15. The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English, op. cit., p. 24.
16. Ibid., p. 25.
17. Ibid., p. 25.

18. The National Interest and the Teaching of English, op. cit., p. 85.
19. The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English, op. cit., p. 7.

APPENDIX I

ILLINOIS SELF-RATING SCALE FOR EXPERIENCED ENGLISH TEACHERS

Developed by the Project Staff of the

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

FORM G: For Experienced English Teachers

Your name _____ Today's date _____

Your position _____
(optional)
(English teacher, Department Chairman, etc.)

School where you teach _____ Location _____ Enrollment _____

Secondary school English teaching experience (in years and months) _____

Secondary school teaching experience (in years and months) _____

Highest degree you hold _____ Granted by _____

Year degree awarded _____ Number of hours beyond that degree _____

College major _____ College minor _____

Schedule of classes for this year:

Subjects taught (English, French, History, etc.)	Grade level	Ability level, if any
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

List all "extra" assignments, such as club sponsorship, study hall duty, yearbook, etc.

Directions: Rate your knowledge in English and your skill in the teaching of English by comparing your preparation with that of other secondary school English teachers who have a comparable number of years of English teaching experience. Use the following evaluative key:

- 1 - Superior-----Clearly outstanding.
- 2 - Good-----Clearly above average.
- 3 - Average----- Do fairly well. No signs of serious weakness. Usually do what is fairly adequate but show no particular knowledge or skill above average.
- 4 - Minimal-----Less than average. Am barely able to meet qualifications
- 5 - Subminimal---Very inadequate. Little or no knowledge or skill in English and the teaching of English. Certain personal characteristics may be serious enough to stand in the way of even minimal performance and success.

Check each qualification as follows: 1-Superior; 2-Good; 3-Average; 4-Minimal; 5-Subminimal

I. PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1. Health, physical stamina
2. Professional relationships: cooperation, dependability, tact
3. Creativity, imagination, resourcefulness
4. Mental alertness, judgment
5. Sense of humor
6. Emotional maturity, poise
7. Initiative, perseverance

1	2	3	4	5	Comment, if you wish.

II. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN ENGLISH

A. Knowledge of Language

8. Knowledge of how language functions, including knowledge of the principles of semantics
9. Knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar
10. Knowledge of levels of usage and dialectology, including a realization of the cultural implications of both
11. Knowledge of the history of the English language, with appropriate awareness of its phonological, morphological, and syntactic changes

1	2	3	4	5	Comment, if you wish.

B. Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition

12. Ability to recognize such characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage
13. Knowledge of theories and history of rhetoric and of the development of English prose
14. Perception of the complexities in the processes of composing
15. Ability to analyze in detail the strengths and weaknesses in the writing of students and to communicate the analysis effectively
16. Proficiency in producing writing with considerable strength in the characteristics noted above

1	2	3	4	5	Comment, if you wish.

Check each qualification as follows: 1-Superior; 2-Good; 3-Average; 4-Minimal; 5-Subminimal

II. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN ENGLISH (cont.)

C. Knowledge and Skill in Literature

	1	2	3	4	5	Comment, if you wish.
17. Knowledge of the important works of major English and American authors; knowledge of the characteristics of various genres and of major works in English and American literature in the genres						
18. Extended knowledge of one or more major authors and of at least one genre, and one period						
19. Knowledge of major works of selected foreign writers, both ancient and modern, and of comparative literature						
20. As part of the awareness of patterns of development, a knowledge of such backgrounds of English and American literature as history, the Bible, mythology, and folklore						
21. Ability to read closely an unfamiliar literary text of above-average difficulty with good comprehension of its content and literary characteristics						
22. Knowledge of major critical theories and schools of criticism						
23. Knowledge of a considerable body of literature suitable for adolescents						

D. Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication

	1	2	3	4	5	Comment, if you wish.
24. Knowledge of the principles of group discussion, group dynamics, oral reporting, panel discussions, classroom dramatizations, and choral reading; knowledge of the relationships between speaking and other facets of English						
25. Knowledge of current information relative to listening techniques						
26. Ability to speak clearly and effectively, and in conformity with present standards of educated usage						
27. Ability to read aloud well enough to convey most aspects of the interpretive art: meaning, mood, dominant emotions, varying emotions, overtones, and variety						

Check each qualification as follows: 1-Superior; 2-Good; 3-Average; 4-Minimal; 5-Subminimal

III. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN TEACHING ENGLISH

1 2 3 4 5 Comment, if you wish.

28. Knowledge of educational psychology, especially of the learning process and adolescent psychology
29. Knowledge of the stages of language growth in children and youth
30. Knowledge of the philosophy, organization, and educational programs of American secondary education now and in historical perspective
31. Knowledge of the content, instructional materials, and organization of secondary English programs, and of the role of English in the total school program
32. Knowledge of principles of curriculum development in English
33. Knowledge of effective ways to teach English, to select and adapt methods and materials for the varying interests and maturity levels of students, and to develop a sequence of assignments to guide and stimulate students in their study of language, written and oral communication, and literature
34. Knowledge of ways to teach reading in the English classroom, including corrective and developmental reading techniques
35. Knowledge of basic principles of evaluation and test construction in English

IV. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: